

Remarks:

Claim rejections – 35USC 102 and 103

Claims 1, 9 , 19 were rejected over Penquignot under section 102 and claim 13 under section 103. Claims 2, 5, 6, 10 were rejected under section 103 over Penquignot and Salling.

Penquignot does not teach input regions in the p-wells as claimed by the independent claims of the present application. Claim 1 states that the input regions are “formed in” the p-wells.

Therefore they suggest additional regions over the already claimed p-wells. The amendment to independent claims 1 and 19 therefore serves merely to clarify this point and is not inserted as a further limitation for purposes of patentability.


Furthermore, the independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended to include details about the isolation ring comprising a p⁺ ring.

In light of the fact that neither Penquignot nor Salling disclose the input regions claimed in claims 1 and 19, the claims should be in a state for allowance.

Allowance of the claims is therefore requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 1/6/, 2006



Jurgen K. Vollrath

VOLLRATH & ASSOCIATES

588 Sutter Street #531, San Francisco, CA, 94102

Telephone: (408) 667 1289